

## **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 13, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 – 14 are pending in the application with Claim 1 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 1 is amended and Claims 9 and 10 are canceled.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "...a data sending and receiving device which sends and receives device information to and from image display devices connected in series to said input interface and said output interface, said image display devices being driven simultaneously...said identification processing device reads specification information from image display devices connected to an output interface by using said data sending and receiving device, extracts data common to its own specification data to edit its own specification data, and stores the edited specification data in said storage device." The features recited in Claim 1 are fully supported throughout the specification and recited in Claims 9 and 10 as originally filed. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,049,316 issued to Nolan et al.

Nolan et al. discloses a PC laptop with multiple refresh-rate configurations using active and default registers to set the refresh rate of a monitor that is intermittently connected to the PC laptop. Nolan et al. does not teach driving multiple monitors simultaneously, nor does Nolan et al. disclose allocating device addresses.

Based on Nolan et al., the disclosed laptop appears to be configured to use a CRT screen when at work or home and the built-in LCD screen when traveling. There is no indication that the laptop is configured to use both the LCD and the CRT at the same time. Therefore, multiple image display devices are not driven simultaneously, as is recited in Applicants' amended Claim 1.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 3 – 10 and 12 – 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 3 – 8 are rejected over Nolan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,614 issued to Mitchell et al., Claim 9 are rejected over Nolan et al. in view of Japanese Publication No. 2001-356752 issued to Tomohiro et al., Claims 10 and 12 are rejected over Nolan et al. in view of Mitchell et al. and further in view of Tomohiro et al., Claim 13 is rejected over Nolan et al. in view of Japanese Publication No. 2000-352962 issued to Jun et al., and Claim 14 is rejected over Nolan et al. in view of Mitchell et al. and Tomohiro et al. and further in view of Jun et al.

Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled by way of the present amendment, and thus the rejections to Claims 9 and 10 are rendered moot.

Since Mitchell et al., Tomohiro et al. and Jun et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations recited in independent Claim 1, from which Claims 2 – 14 depend, Claims 3 – 8 and 12 – 14 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above.

Further, with respect to Claims 13 and 14, none of the cited references disclose any of the limitations recited in these claims. Specifically, Claims 13 and 14 recite: "...a response device which processes index control responses in a multiple monitor environment using indexes, even when it is not physically connected to a host computer." Neither Jun et al., Mitchell et al. nor

Tomohiro et al. disclose any such response device. The cited references disclose or suggest that the display device is connected to a host computer in order to provide functionality.

Therefore, since the limitations recited in Claims 13 and 14 are not disclosed by the cited prior art references, Claims 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable on their own.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 – 8 and 11 – 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:tam